

The Prioritized Inductive Logic Programs¹

Shilong Ma^{†,2}, Yuefei Sui^{‡,3}, Ke Xu^{†,2}

[†] Department of Computer Science

Beijing University of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Beijing 100083, China

[‡] Key Laboratory of Intelligent Information Processing

Institute of Computing Technology, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100080, China

Abstract: The limit behavior of inductive logic programs has not been explored, but when considering incremental or online inductive learning algorithms which usually run ongoingly, such behavior of the programs should be taken into account. An example is given to show that some inductive learning algorithm may not be correct in the long run if the limit behavior is not considered. An inductive logic program is *convergent* if given an increasing sequence of example sets, the program produces a corresponding sequence of the Horn logic programs which has the set-theoretic limit, and is *limit-correct* if the limit of the produced sequence of the Horn logic programs is correct with respect to the limit of the sequence of the example sets. It is shown that the GOLEM system is not limit-correct. Finally, a limit-correct inductive logic system, called the prioritized GOLEM system, is proposed as a solution.

Keywords: Inductive Logic Program, Machine Learning, Limit.

1. Introduction

As information increases exponentially, it becomes more and more important to discover useful knowledge in massive information. Inductive logic programming is used in learning a general theory from given examples. In incremental learning, the examples are usually given one by one. After a new example is obtained, the current theory learned from previous examples might need to be updated to fit all the examples given so far. Thus we get a sequence of theories $\Pi_1, \Pi_2, \dots, \Pi_n, \dots$. Sometimes there might be infinitely many examples and this procedure may not stop, i.e., there may not exist a natural number k such that $\Pi_k = \Pi_{k+1} = \dots$. For example, if we restrict the theories to Horn logic programs, then there exists some Herbrand interpretation I such that we will never find a finite program Π whose least Herbrand model is equal to I , because the set of Herbrand interpretations is uncountable while the set of finite Horn logic programs is only countable ([10]). So we should consider some kind of the limits of theories which should be correct with respect to all the examples.

Formally introducing the set-theoretic limits of sequences of first order theories into logic and computer science, and using theory versions as approximations of some formal theories in convergent infinite computations are the independent contributions by Li. Li ([4],[5]) defined the set-theoretic limits of first order theories, and thereon gave a formal system of

¹The project was partially supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China and the National 973 Project of China under the grant number G1999032701.

²Email: {slma, kexu}@nlsde.buaa.edu.cn.

³Email: suiyyff@hotmail.com.

the inductive logic. Precisely, given a sequence $\{\Pi_n\}$ of the first order theories, the set-theoretic limit of $\{\Pi_n\}$, denoted by $\Pi = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Pi_n$, is the set of the sentences such that every sentence in Π is in almost every Π_n , and every sentence in infinitely many Π_n 's is in Π also. The set-theoretic limit does not always exist for any sequence of the first order theories. In the following sections we use the limits as the set-theoretic limits.

The limit behaviors of an inductive logic program should be an important research topic which has not been explored. Nowadays most of the softwares and algorithms are incremental or online, which run in the long run. When we consider the correctness problem of such softwares and algorithms, their limit behaviors should be taken into account. In this paper we focus on incremental inductive learning algorithms in inductive logic programs. Assume that examples come in sequences, let E_n be the example set at time n . An inductive learning algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ produces a theory $\mathcal{A}(E_n)$, for every n , which is correct with respect to E_n . Later we shall give an example to show that some inductive learning algorithms may not be correct in the long run if the limit behavior is not considered. Concerning the limit behavior, a reasonable inductive learning algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ should satisfy the following conditions:

- *The convergence:* Given a sequence $\{E_n\}$ of the example sets such that $E_1 \subseteq E_2 \subseteq E_3 \subseteq \dots$, $\{\mathcal{A}(E_n)\}$ has the set-theoretic limit;
- *The limit-correctness:* The limit of $\{\mathcal{A}(E_n)\}$ should be correct with respect to the limit of $\{E_n\}$, that is, for any $e \in \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_n$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{A}(E_n) \vdash e$;

Based on the above requirements, we consider the empirical ILP systems: FOIL, GOLEM and MOBAL. Because FOIL and MOBAL are function-free, we focus on the GOLEM system.

In the following, our discussion is based on a fixed logical language which contains only finitely many predicate symbols.

The authors ([7]) considered the limit behavior of the Horn logic programs, and proved the following theorem:

Theorem 1.1([7]). Given a sequence $\{\Pi_n\}$ of Horn logic programs, if $\Pi = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Pi_n$ exists and for every sufficiently large n , Π_n satisfies an assumption that *for every clause in Π_n , every term occurring in the body also occurs in the head*, then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{M}(\Pi_n) = \mathcal{M}(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Pi_n),$$

where $\mathcal{M}$ is an operator such that for any Horn logic program Π , $\mathcal{M}(\Pi)$ is the least Herbrand model of Π .

To consider the limit-correctness of inductive logic programs, we assume that the inductive logic programs satisfy the convergence. Given an inductive logic program $\mathcal{A}$, if for every positive example set E_n , $\mathcal{A}(E_n)$ is a Horn logic program which is correct with respect to E_n , i.e., $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{A}(E_n)) \supseteq E_n$, and $\mathcal{A}(E_n)$ satisfies the assumption, then by theorem 1.1,

$$\mathcal{M}(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{A}(E_n)) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{A}(E_n)) \supseteq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_n,$$

so $\mathcal{A}$ is limit-correct. Therefore, to make $\mathcal{A}$ satisfy the limit-correctness, we should design $\mathcal{A}$ such that for any input E , $\mathcal{A}(E)$ is a Horn logic program satisfying the assumption. We shall give two examples to show that the current GOLEM system may not always produce a

logic program satisfying the assumption. We modify the GOLEM system to be a prioritized one in which a priority order is defined on the literals. In detail, let $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{P}$ be the GOLEM algorithm and the prioritized GOLEM algorithm such that for any example set E , $\mathcal{G}(E)$ and $\mathcal{P}(E)$ are the Horn logic program produced by the GOLEM system and the prioritized GOLEM system, respectively. Then, for a set E of examples, $\mathcal{G}(E)$ may not satisfy the assumption, but $\mathcal{P}(E)$ satisfies the assumption. Hence, $\mathcal{P}$ is limit-correct.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we shall give the basic definition of the GOLEM system, the distance on terms and formulas, and the set-theoretic limits. In section 3, we shall consider the limit-correctness of the GOLEM system, and give two examples to show that the GOLEM system is not limit-correct and sensitive to the ordering of the examples. In section 4, we shall propose the prioritized GOLEM system, and prove that the prioritized GOLEM system is limit-correct, and not sensitive to the ordering of the examples. The last section concludes the paper.

Our notation is standard, references are [1,2,6].

2. The GOLEM system

In this section, we first give a basic introduction to the GOLEM system. Similar to Nienhuys-Cheng's definition of the distance on terms and formulas([10]), we give the following definition.

Definition 2.1. Let f and g be an n -ary and an m -ary function symbols, respectively. The distance ρ is defined as follows.

$$(2.1) \quad \rho(t, t) = 0, \text{ for any term } t;$$

$$(2.2) \quad \text{If } f \neq g, \text{ then } \rho(f(t_1, \dots, t_n), g(s_1, \dots, s_m)) = 1;$$

$$(2.3) \quad \rho(f(t_1, \dots, t_n), f(s_1, \dots, s_n)) = \frac{\max\{\rho(t_i, s_i) \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\}}{\max\{\rho(t_i, s_i) \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\} + 1},$$

where $t_1, \dots, t_n, s_1, \dots, s_m$ are terms.

The distance defined above is a little different from the one given by Nienhuys-Cheng in that the value which the distance can take has a simple form $\frac{1}{m}$ for some natural number. Such a distance is used to measure the difference between two trees in graph theory. Every term t can be taken as a tree T_t . For example, $t = f(t_1, \dots, t_n)$, the tree T_t has a root with symbol f and n -many children $T_{t_1}, \dots, T_{t_n}$. We say that two terms t and t' are the same to depth m if T_t and $T_{t'}$ are the same to depth m .

Given two clauses C_1, C_2 , to compute the least general generalization of C_1 and C_2 , denoted by $\text{lgg}(C_1, C_2)$, we give the following procedure:

Step 1. Given two terms $t = f(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ and $s = g(s_1, \dots, s_m)$,

$$\text{lgg}(t, s) = \begin{cases} v & \text{if } f \neq g \\ f(\text{lgg}(t_1, s_1), \dots, \text{lgg}(t_n, s_n)) & \text{if } f = g, \end{cases}$$

where v is any new variable.

Step 2. Given two literals $l_1 = (\neg)^{k_1} p(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ and $l_2 = (\neg)^{k_2} q(s_1, \dots, s_m)$,

$$\text{lgg}(l_1, l_2) = \begin{cases} \text{undefined} & \text{if } k_1 \neq k_2 \text{ or } p \neq q \\ (\neg)^{k_1} p_1(\text{lgg}(t_1, s_1), \dots, \text{lgg}(t_n, s_n)) & \text{if } k_1 = k_2 \text{ and } p = q, \end{cases}$$

where $k_1 = 0$ or 1 , $(\neg)^0 = ,$ $(\neg)^1 = \neg$.

Step 3. Given two clauses $C_1 = \{l_1, \dots, l_n\}$ and $C_2 = \{l'_1, \dots, l'_m\}$,

$$\text{lgg}(C_1, C_2) = \{\text{lgg}(l_i, l'_j) : 1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq m, \text{lgg}(l_i, l'_j) \text{ is defined}\}.$$

Given two sets A, B of clauses, define

$$\text{lgg}(A, B) = \{\text{lgg}(C_1, C_2) : C_1 \in A, C_2 \in B, d(C_1, C_2) = \min\{d(C_1, C_2) : C_2 \in B\} \text{ \& } \text{lgg}(C_1, C_2) \text{ exists}\}.$$

Muggleton and Feng [8] showed that if Γ is a finite set of ground literals then the rlgg of two clauses of C_1 and C_2 with respect to Π is the lgg of $\Pi \rightarrow C_1$ and $\Pi \rightarrow C_2$. Based on the property, they gave the ILP learning system GOLEM which is the only learning system explicitly based on the notion of relative least general generalization.

The GOLEM system:

Suppose we are given a logic program Γ (i.e., a background knowledge) and two examples (two ground atoms) E_1 and E_2 such that $\Gamma \not\models E_1$ and $\Gamma \not\models E_2$. We construct the lgg C of E_1 and E_2 relative to Γ , so $\Gamma \wedge C \vdash E_1 \wedge E_2$ and C is used only once in the derivation of both E_1 and E_2 . Let $\Gamma = \{p_1, \dots, p_n, \dots\}$.

Define $C_1 = ((\neg p_1 \vee \neg p_2 \vee \dots) \vee E_1)$, $C_2 = ((\neg p_1 \vee \neg p_2 \vee \dots) \vee E_2)$, set $C = \text{lgg}(C_1, C_2)$.

Definition 2.2. Given a sequence $\{A_n\}$ of sets of formulas, the set-theoretic limit of $\{A_n\}$ exists, denoted by $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_n$, if

$$\overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_n = \underline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_n$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_n &= \{\varphi : \exists^\infty n (\varphi \in A_n)\}; \\ \underline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} A_n &= \{\varphi : \exists n_0 \forall n \geq n_0 (\varphi \in A_n)\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\exists^\infty n$ means that there are infinitely many n .

3. The limit-correctness of the GOLEM system

In this section we consider the limit-correctness of the GOLEM system, and give two examples to show that the GOLEM system is not limit-correct, and sensitive to the ordering of the examples.

Let p be a predicate saying that x is an even number if $p(x)$; and s be the successor function, i.e., $s(x)$ is the successor of x . Let

$$E_n = \{p(0), p(s^2(0)), \dots, p(s^{2n}(0))\}.$$

There are two inductive learning algorithms to produce two different theories for E_n .

Case 1. One inductive learning algorithm produces $T_n = \{p(0); p(s^2(x)) \leftarrow p(x)\}$, given E_n . Then T_n is a Horn logic program and the least Herbrand model of T_n is

$$M_n = \{p(0), p(s^2(0)), \dots, p(s^{2^m}(0)), \dots\}.$$

Then we have that

$$T = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} T_n = T_1;$$

$$M = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} M_n = M_1.$$

The least Herbrand model of T is M .

Case 2. Another inductive learning algorithm produces $S_n = \{p(s^{2^n}(0)); p(x) \leftarrow p(s^2(x))\}$, given E_n . Then, S_n is a Horn logic program and the least Herbrand model, say N_n of S_n is E_n . But

$$S = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_n = \{p(x) \leftarrow p(s^2(x))\};$$

$$N = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} N_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_n = M_1.$$

The least Herbrand model, say $M(S)$, of S is equal to the empty set. Then

$$M(S) \neq N.$$

That is, for any $e \in N$, $S \not\models e$.

Example 3.1. Assume that E_n is given as above, then the GOLEM system produces the following sequence of the Horn logic programs:

$$\begin{aligned} T_0 &= \{p(0)\}; \\ T_1 &= \{p(0); \pi_1\}; \\ T_2 &= \{p(0); \pi_1; \text{lgg}(\pi_1, \pi_2)\} \\ &= \{p(0); \pi_1, p(s^2(x)) \leftarrow p(x)\} \\ &= \{p(0); p(s^2(x)) \leftarrow p(x)\}, \\ T_3 &= T_2, \\ &\dots \\ T_n &= T_2, \\ &\dots \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_2 &= \{\neg(\neg p(0) \vee p(s^2(0))), p(s^4(0))\} \\ &= \{p(0), p(s^4(0))\} \wedge \{\neg p(s^2(0)), p(s^4(0))\}, \\ \pi_1 &= \{\neg p(0), p(s^2(0))\}, \\ \text{lgg}(\pi_1, \pi_2) &= \{p(s^2(x)), \neg p(x)\}. \end{aligned}$$

We change the ordering of the occurrences of $p(s^{2n}(s))$'s and see what the GOLEM system gets.

Example 3.2. Assume that

$$\begin{aligned}
E'_0 &= \{p(s^4(0))\}, \\
E'_1 &= E_0 \cup \{p(s^2(0))\}, \\
E'_2 &= E_1 \cup \{p(0)\}, \\
&\dots \\
E'_{3k} &= E_{3k-1} \cup \{p(s^{6k+4}(0))\}, \\
E'_{3k+1} &= E_{3k} \cup \{p(s^{6k+2}(0))\}, \\
E'_{3k+2} &= E_{3k+1} \cup \{p(s^{6k}(0))\}, \\
&\dots
\end{aligned}$$

Then the GOLEM system produces the following sequence of the Horn logic programs:

$$\begin{aligned}
S_0 &= \{p(s^4(0))\}; \\
S_1 &= \{p(s^4(0)); \gamma_1\}; \\
S_2 &= \{p(s^4(0)); \gamma_1; \text{lgg}(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)\} \\
&= \{p(s^4(0)); \gamma_1; p(x) \leftarrow p(s^2(x))\} \\
&= \{p(s^4(0)); p(x) \leftarrow p(s^2(x))\}, \\
&\dots \\
S_{3k+i} &= \{p(s^{6k+4-2i}(0)); p(x) \leftarrow p(s^2(x))\}, \\
&\dots
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma_1 &= \{\neg p(s^4(0)), p(s^2(0))\}, \\
\gamma_2 &= \{p(s^4(0)), p(0)\} \wedge \{\neg p(s^2(0)), p(0)\}, \\
\text{lgg}(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) &= \{p(x), \neg p(s^2(x))\}.
\end{aligned}$$

By the above discussion, this example shows that the GOLEM system is not limit-correct, and sensitive to the ordering of the examples.

4. The prioritized GOLEM system

In the section, we give the prioritized GOLEM system which is limit-correct and not sensitive to the ordering of the examples. In [6] the authors proposed an assumption on the Horn logic programs which guarantees that the least Herbrand model of the limit of a sequence of Horn logic programs is the limit of the least Herbrand models of the logic programs, and the least Herbrand model of the former limit is stable with respect to the sequences of the Horn logic programs.

Definition 4.1. A clause is *simple* if every subterm occurring in the body of the clause occurs in the head of the clause. A logic program is *simple* if every clause in it is simple.

The assumption in section 1 requires that the Horn logic program be simple.

Given an example set E , we modify the GOLEM system to be a new algorithm $\mathcal{P}$ such that $\mathcal{P}(E)$ is simple.

We first define a relation $\prec$ on the literals. Given two literals l and l' , we say that l has a higher priority than l' , denoted by $l \prec l'$, if every sub-term occurring in l occurs in l' .

Proposition 4.2. $\prec$ is a pre-order, that is, $\prec$ is reflexive and transitive.

The prioritized GOLEM system:

Suppose we are given a logic program Γ (i.e., a background knowledge) and two examples (two ground atoms) E_1 and E_2 such that $\Gamma \not\models E_1$ and $\Gamma \not\models E_2$. We construct the lgg C of E_1 and E_2 relative to Γ , so $\Gamma \wedge C \vdash E_1 \wedge E_2$ and C is used only once in the derivation of both E_1 and E_2 . Let $\Gamma = \{p_1, \dots, p_n, \dots\}$.

Define $C_1 = ((\neg q_1 \vee \neg q_2 \vee \dots) \vee e_1)$, $C_2 = ((\neg q'_1 \vee \neg q'_2 \vee \dots) \vee e_2)$, set $C = \text{lgg}(C_1, C_2)$, where $q_1, q_2, \dots, e_1$ is the set $\Gamma \cup \{E_1\}$ under the order $\prec$, that is, $\{q_1, q_2, \dots, e_1\} = \Gamma \cup \{E_1\}$ and $e_1 \not\prec q_i$ for every i ; similarly define $\{q'_1, q'_2, \dots, e_2\}$.

The prioritized GOLEM system on sequences:

Given a sequence $\{E_n\}$ of example sets, at stage n , input E_n . If $E_n \not\prec E_i$ for any $i < n$ then use the GOLEM system directly to produce a Horn logic program, say $\mathcal{P}(E_n)$; otherwise, find the least $i < n$ such that $E_n \prec E_{i+1}$, then use the GOLEM system to $\bigcup_{j>i}^n E_j$ with background knowledge $\mathcal{P}(E_i)$. Let $\mathcal{P}(E_n)$ be the resulted theory.

Theorem 4.3. Given an example set E , $\mathcal{P}(E)$ is simple.

Proof. By the definition of the pre-order, when a clause π is enumerated in $\mathcal{P}(E)$ the instance of the head of π always has the lowest priority among E . This guarantees that π is simple.

Therefore, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 4.4. $\mathcal{P}$ is convergent, and limit-correct. That is, given an increasing sequence $\{E_n\}$ of positive example sets,

(4.1) $\{\mathcal{P}(E_n)\}$ is a sequence of Horn logic programs which has the set-theoretic limit;

(4.2) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{P}(E_n)$ is limit-correct with respect to $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_n$.

Proof. By the discussion in section 1, we only need to prove (4.1). To prove (4.1), by the definition of the pre-order $\prec$, $\prec$ is well-founded. Given an example e , there are only finitely many e' with $e' \prec e$. Assume that when e is enumerated in E_n for some n , a clause π is produced. π is extracted out of $\mathcal{P}(E_n)$ only when an example $e' \prec e$ is enumerated in E_n .

for some $n' > n$. Hence, π cannot be enumerated in $\mathcal{P}(E_n)$ and be extracted out of $\mathcal{P}(E_n)$ for infinitely many n . Therefore, $\{\mathcal{P}(E_n)\}$ has the set-theoretic limit.

5. Conclusion and further work

When input a set E of examples, the prioritized GOLEM system produces a Horn logic program $\mathcal{P}(E)$ which is simple. The simple Horn logic programs have many good properties that a common Horn logic program has not. The prioritized GOLEM system is based on the syntactical properties of the examples, that is, the priority order $\prec$ on the literals, which make the prioritized GOLEM system useful in diverse applications.

A further work could be based on the distance defined on the terms or formulas of a logical language. Such the distance definitions can be the ones given by Fitting([3]) or Nienhuys-Cheng([9]). Then the Cauchy sequences of terms or formulas can be defined. Then the convergence and the limit-correctness can be defined in terms of the Cauchy sequences of the example sets and the Horn logic programs. It is conjectured that the prioritized GOLEM system also satisfies the convergence and the limit-correctness defined on Cauchy sequences.

References:

- [1] F. Bergadano and D. Gunetti, *Inductive Logic Programming: from machine learning to software engineering*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, 1996.
- [2] M. Dahr, *Deductive Databases: Theory and Applications*, International Thomson Computer Press, 1997.
- [3] M. Fitting, Metric methods, three examples and a theorem, *J. of Logic Programming* 21(1994), 113-127.
- [4] W. Li, An Open Logic System, *Science in China* (Scientia Sinica) (series A), 10(1992)(in Chinese), 1103-1113.
- [5] W. Li, A logical Framework for Inductive Inference and Its rationality, in Fu,N.(eds.): *Advanced Topics in Artificial Intelligence*, LNAI 1747, Springer, 1999.
- [6] J. W. Lloyd, *Foundations of Logic Programming*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1987.
- [7] S. Ma, Y. Sui and K. Xu, The limits of the Horn logic programs. *Proc. of 18th International Conference on Logic Programming* (poster session), Denmark, to appear, 2002. Full paper is available at <http://www.nlsde.buaa.edu.cn/~kexu>
- [8] S. Muggleton and C. Feng, Efficient inductive of logic programs, in: *Proc. of the First Conf. on Algorithmic Learning Theory*, Tokyo, 1990, Ohmsha.
- [9] S. H. Nienhuys-Cheng, Distances and limits on Herbrand Interpretations, *Proc. of the 8th International Workshop on Inductive Programming*, LNAI 1446, Springer, 1998, 250-260.

- [10] S. H. Nienhuys-Cheng, Distance between Herbrand Interpretations: A Measure for Approximations to a Target Concept, in: *Proc. of the 7th International Workshop on Inductive Logic Programming*, LNAI 1297, Springer, 1997, 213-226.
- [11] G. Plotkin, A note on inductive generalization, in B. Meltzer and D. Michies, eds., *Machine Intelligence* 5, 153-163, Edinburgh Univ. Press, 1970.
- [12] G. Plotkin, A further note on inductive generalization, in B. Meltzer and D. Michies, eds., *Machine Intelligence* 6, 101-124, Edinburgh Univ. Press, 1971.